tant trends now evident in the international law affecting the jurisdiction of territorial waters. I suggest that the incidents of the last few days may give crisis flavor to a matter which has previously had only urgent concern in the minds of too few of our Nation's leaders.

I may be wrong, but I await the exchanges before the United Nations with great interest as to the claims and counterclaims as to who was the provocateur in the disturbing warlike incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin.

(Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BARRETT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NEW LAWS ARE WHAT MAKE PROGRESS POSSIBLE

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have kept faith in the American people, in their moral code, and in their respect for law and order, have been confident of the ultimate success of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It has seemed a simple truth to those of us who voted for passage of this law that although laws by themselves cannot make people good, they can make good people safe, and they can establish standards of behavior for all people to follow. And we know that those who would deny the force and influence of the law on both the individual and society must also deny the force and influence of the Ten Commandments, the Laws of Moses, the Old Testament and the New Testament, the Code of Justinian, Anglo-American Jurisprudence, and all the other great codes and bodies of law which have supported, encouraged, and guided civilizations from the earliest times. But these things cannot be denied.

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, coauthors of the widely syndicated column, "Inside Report," have written an article for the current August 8, 1964 issue of the New Republic, entitled "Birmingham—Keeping Our Fingers Crossed," illustrating the effects of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which are already noticeable. Of Birmingham, Ala., the authors write:

> This city, whose violence and murder spawned the civil rights bill last summer, is now the hopeful symbol of southern compliance with the new act.

That statement was made after observing the events that have transpired in Birmingham since the act was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson on July 2, 1964. For, contrary to the dire predictions of those who opposed the civil rights bill, there have been no riots in Birmingham. According to Evans and Novak, there has not been any trouble worthy to be dignified an "incident."

The authors' conclusion is one that bears repeating:

> There is a great lesson in Birmingham. Over the years, public figures from Dwight Eisenhower to BARRY GOLDWATER have said that progress in civil rights depends on a change in men's hearts, not new laws. Birmingham today seems to prove otherwise, that new laws are what make progress possible.

It has been only a month since the enactment of the Civil Rights Act. But the record of achievement already established by the responsible citizens of Birmingham is a hopeful sign. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

BIRMINGHAM—"KEEPING OUR FINGERS CROSSED"

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Perhaps it is only Birmingham purging itself. This city, whose violence and murder spawned the civil rights bill last summer, is now the hopeful symbol of southern compliance with the new act. Compliance in moderate, progressive Atlanta would have been no surprise. In segregationist, tension-ridden Birmingham, it seems a miracle.

But there are no miracles today in the South, particularly not in this rawboned, blue-collar steel town that sprouted out of Alabama's coal and iron ore deposits during the industrial revolution. The story of Birmingham's decision to accept, not to fight, the toughest civil rights law in history is the story of fastidious planning, dating back to last summer even before President Kennedy had finally decided to ask Congress to outlaw discrimination in public accommodations.

"We're still keeping our fingers crossed," William (Billy) Hamilton, a slight, chain-smoking political technician, told us the other day. Hamilton is executive secretary to Mayor Albert Boutwell. One source of possible trouble is the lurking figure of Gov. George Wallace. Wallace has been ominously quiet about Birmingham's new life. He might still turn triumph into disaster.

One motel (which shall be nameless) was schizophrenic about the new law's public accommodations section. When other motels and hotels decided to admit Negroes the moment President Johnson signed the new law, it threatened to hold out. City officials pleaded with the manager:

"The choice of course is yours, but if you can't go along please resign from the motel association. It is vital when the association issues its announcement of compliance that it be unanimous."

Reluctantly, the holdout went along. The hotel and motel association's July 3 announcement proclaimed to "the traveling public and the citizens of Birmingham" that compliance "will be observed by all members."

One place to view the new Birmingham is the Parliament House, a swank motel with plush lounges and elegant bars—and, of course, a lily-white clientele until now. At the Parliament House one day last week, two Negro young women chatted softly over their meal in the pleasant, sun-lit lunchroom, surrounded by whites. Across the lunchroom, a white-collared Negro, sportily dressed, ate alone. The scene was scarcely credible in a city that a year ago was dishonored by the snarl of police dogs, the arrogant presence of Wallace's State troopers, and the bombing-murder of children.

In the heart of downtown Birmingham, Abe Slotnik's 20th Century Restaurant, where lawyers and bankers like to eat lunch, was all white on the day we stopped in. "No one ... be in here," Slotnik said. "When they ... they'll be served just like you. I'm not fighting the Government."

So far there has not been any trouble worthy to be dignified as an "incident." The closest to it came one evening in the formal dining room of the Parliament House. Two white couples got up and walked out when a party of nine Negroes walked in. The whites had ordered their meal and left without paying.

"We let them go," a Parliament House clerk explained. "The food hadn't gotten to their table. But it was foolish of them. They probably found the same thing at the next place."

What has happened in Birmingham the past few weeks is not the start of the biracial millenium. But as a case study of compliance with a law repellent to the majority, today's Birmingham story is as encouraging as last year's violence was frightening.

It starts with a document composed by Billy Hamilton at the instruction of the mayor and the request of the chamber of commerce shortly after the Senate adopted cloture on the civil rights bill. Cloture ended the filibuster and assured passage of a strong bill.

Acting on orders from Mayor Boutwell, Hamilton had been in and out of Washington for weeks, conferring with top administration officials and with Northern businessmen with extensive interests in the South. Beginning last summer these businessmen had been secretly helping the Kennedy-Johnson administration prepare the way for the law.

Dated June 23, Hamilton's document has become a classic. Mayors and chambers of commerce all over the South have asked for it to help their own adjustment to the public accommodations section of the new law. It has three basic features:

First, it makes no effort to "sell" compliance to reluctant businessmen.

Second, it states flatly that "the real danger of disorder or disruption of business will lie in reaching no decision at all—in making no plans" to deal with the sweeping changes of the new law. The absence of plan, it adds, "will leave revolutionary elements free to operate on their own initiative—in effect, fill a vacuum."

Third, it pledges police protection to proprietors of restaurants, hotels, motels, lunch counters and other "public accommodations," whether they plan to comply with the law or resist it until tested in the courts.

This pledge of police protection by the city of Birmingham, working with the business community, was the foundation on which the city built its compliance program. The dynamics of the civil rights revolution, particularly in the South, have proved that a reliable police force under the direction of men committed to law enforcement is the big obstacle to rule of the mob.

Birmingham learned this from the violence that spread through its streets last year. But last year, for example, Birmingham's police department did not have much of a chance. On several occasions (once right after a truce had been reached with the Negro demonstrators) Wallace's State troopers rolled into Birmingham, clubbing and bullying, and preempted the city's own law enforcement.

The drafting of the city document (labeled ponderously "An Informational Memorandum With Regard to the Civil Rights Act of 1964") followed a series of quiet discussions between city officials and half a dozen leading citizens of Birmingham, all of them members of the chamber of commerce. These meetings started in early May. Frank Newton, the president of the chamber, and Crawford Jonhson, III, the president-elect, carried the main load for business. Mayor

This generation and those to follow will indelibly mark your role in mass communications and cherish the legacy you have entrusted to them.

For demonstrating in the traditional American way that hard work, intelligence, and uncompromising integrity are still the formula by which success can be attained in public life, you have shown that life dedicated to others can gain the loftiest heights despite the most humble of beginnings.

By unanimous action of the Faculty of the School of Journalism of Syracuse University, we hereby, on this 4th day of August 1964, award you this Gold Medal for Distinguished Service to Journalism.

SAMUEL I. NEWHOUSE

Since earliest recorded history, the maxim that "Behind every man * * *" has gained credence. This is no less true today as exemplified by a life devoted to husband, family, community, and Nation. In your role as wife, mother, colleague, and spirited citizen, you have—for more than four decades—marched side by side with your distinguished husband.

Your diversity of interests, your deep human sympathy and intelligent awareness are to a significant degree responsible for the achievements which we honor today. Your interest in design, your leadership in fashion, and your knowledge of the arts have had an undeniable impact and reflection in many aspects of the publications under the Newhouse aegis.

Your service to important causes has transcended the most generous bounds. You have given a great part of your life to civic, social, and welfare activities. Your influence will continue to serve as an inspiration to others.

For your loyalty, for your humility, for your wise guidance and counsel, and for your efforts in so many quiet and unnoticed ways * * * by unanimous action of the faculty of the School of Journalism of Syracuse University, we hereby, on this 4th day of August 1964, award you this Gold Medal for Distinguished Service to Journalism.

TEXT OF NEWHOUSE ADDRESS

(Following is the text of an address delivered by Samuel I. Newhouse last night at a dinner in his honor at Hotel Syracuse.)

Governor Rockefeller, Chancellor Tolley, friends, it seems a long time ago—some 5 years—since Chancellor Tolley and I first sat down to discuss the possibility of creating a communications center at Syracuse.

And may I say at the outset what a satisfying experience it has been to work with our chancellor on this project.

It has been stimulating to watch an idea grow into a handsome structure—the first of three dedicated to the education of promising young news talent.

I cannot be unaware of a dramatic contrast that concerns my name. The first time it appeared anywhere was on a birth certificate written in a New York City tenement, where I was born.

I am proud of that.

Tomorrow I will see my name inscribed on the wall of what is perhaps the most modern school of communication in the world. I am proud of that, too.

But I am proudest of my ties with the people gathered in this room tonight—first, of course, my immediate family: my wife, my sons, and my grandchildren; my brothers and sisters; and my old and good friends.

They all know how I cherish them.

My particular embrace tonight, too, is to my professional associates here. It is to those editors and publishers who, over the years, have nourished and helped develop our family of newspapers.

For the fact is that I look upon our newspapers as a family and at each acquisition as if of another child.

Our elementary concern is of its health and then its growth. Although each is flesh of our flesh, and ink of our ink, each develops in its own way, with its own looks, its own views, its own independent spirit—the way children do.

They speak differently, too—for they are the voices of all America. Their accents are from the far Northwest, the East, and the South—accents from all the regions of our land. But despite the differences in accents, they are united in one common aim: the newspapers' dedication to the truth.

The mass media are enormously influential. They affect human judgment, shape our desires, and influence our choices. They can lull a community into complacency or charge the atmosphere with reforming zeal. They can appeal to the grossest urges or cultivate the highest aspirations. They can subvert an entire nation or they can enhance an open society.

Communication is a two-way process. We may print words, broadcast a speech, or televise an event but the man who reads, or listens, or watches is also a part of the process of communication. The mass media have a special responsibility in making sure that the news of the world is reported accurately. But all of us—from the lowliest private citizen to the highest officials of industry, labor, education, and government must share in this responsibility.

We are entrusted with instruments of massive power—the press, the microphone, and the camera. Indeed, they are the crucial weapons in a struggle for men's minds and hearts. They are also the vital implements for creating the good society.

Our ever-bigger cities call for new ways of keeping things in harmony with human values. Complex social movements must be explained clearly if each person is to play an intelligent role. In a democracy, political life must be kept meaningful for the average man if he is to remain a vital participant.

It is right and fitting that such a communications center be located within a dynamic university with world-embracing interests. The many fields of study provide an unparalleled opportunity for the interplay of creative talents of the first rank.

That is why all of us in communications, education, and government have a special responsibility to report to the peoples of the world and to our own people, and in reporting today's news the mass communicators must understand the forces that work in the world around us. Policies of nations and peoples alter too quickly for journalists to make inflexible judgments. Today's so-called enemy is tomorrow's friend. Indeed, we have no lasting enemies so much as we have ill-informed peoples.

In the end, it is the quality of persons who choose to make mass media their career that counts. We hope—my wife, my sons, and myself—that the brightest possible young men and women will be found and awarded scholarships at this center. It is our hope that the most accomplished teachers who can be found will continue to be added to the present outstanding faculty as an incentive to journalism students to come to Syracuse.

It is our hope that great leaders of this Nation and the world will be drawn to its forums and seminars to shed the light of their experience and judgment on the great issues of the day, thus making this city and this university a continuing focus of interest and culture.

And so, I am grateful to Chancellor Tolley for having shown me the way, for helping me fulfill the responsibility I feel as a publisher toward this community and Nation. I am happy that I can share this pride in my lifetime with all of you here tonight.

Tomorrow the President of the United United States will dedicate the great building which will bear the name first written on a birth certificate in the tenements of New York.

For all of this, Governor Rockefeller, Chancellor Tolley, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen—I am deeply grateful and proud.

(Mr. TAFT (at the request of Mr. SCHADEBERG) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. TAFT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

NORTH VIETNAM PROVOCATIVE ATTACK ON DESTROYERS

(Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we here in Congress and Americans throughout our land are asking themselves what, if any, are the hidden motives and undetermined meanings of the North Vietnam provocative attack on the destroyers of our 7th Fleet. I should like to suggest one very disturbing possibility and predict that its presence in this matter will soon be acknowledged.

For the past 35 years the Soviet Union has pursued a strategy of reducing the area of the ocean classified as the "high seas" or international waters. In this manner the Soviets have sought to degrade the naval power of the United States and reduce its area of operation and effectiveness as a weapon in the arsenal of freedom. Techniques utilized by the Russians have been to create new historic bays; to extend territorial waters; to use the outer limits of the Continental Shelf to determine limits of controlled seas. It is not surprising to find other Communist controlled states employing these same arguments and techniques.

May I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the opening cries of the North Vietnamese will ring with righteous cries of indignation accusing the destroyers, the U.S.S. *Maddox* and the *C. Turner Joy* of illegal intrusion into waters defined as within the territorial jurisdiction of North Vietnam.

The further extension of the doctrines now being forwarded and projected by Communist strategy, could, in the South Pacific and Far East area, bring all narrow oceanic passages under the jurisdiction of coastal or island states.

The effective and free use of naval forces would by the same token be measurably reduced. There is a disturbing, yes, an alarming trend which seeks to impose restraints on the deployment of seaborne forces on the historic high seas. The developing limitations and restraints are calculated to harm most seriously the United States because of our heavy reliance upon our superiority in naval striking power.

Mr. Speaker, one of the serious reasons behind my introduction of H.R. 11232, providing for research and study of the development of the law of the seas was to alert the United States to these impor-